

From: [Jessica Winter](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: Re: FW: July 19th Chemical Fate Modeling Presentation Posted
Date: 08/13/2010 12:31 PM

Hi Eric- Sorry I forgot to copy you on that email. I will remember to do so in the future.
I was talking about the accuracy of the model. Yes, as I understand it, the predicted deposition rates shown as blue, green, yellow, and orange are within the uncertainty of the model. As I understand it, the empirical data used to check the sed model was the bathymetry data with an accuracy of about 7.5 cm, measured roughly once/yr, so the model can't be assumed to have mm/yr level accuracy, so that level of detail on this map is difficult to interpret. Given the model uncertainty, essentially everything on this map would be lumped in a single category of <7.5 cm/yr except for a few areas within the red sections. But if the purpose of this figure is just to show whether the diagnostic cells are in erosional or depositional areas, then it works fine.

Sorry I had to jump off the TCT early this week-- Michigan oil spill stuff came up. I'll be in the office from here on out but working most of the time on that, so please just give me a heads up if you need anything from NOAA. Thanks.

Jessica Winter
NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
Seattle, WA 98115
Office phone (206) 526-4540
Cell phone (630) 779-4755
Fax (206) 526-6865
jessica.winter@noaa.gov

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

> Jessica, does this answer your question?

>

> I am curious about your comment that the bathymetry was only accurate to
> 7.5 cm and the model predictions were generally higher. Are talking
> about the model output or the accuracy of the model? Looking at the
> figure in question, the modeled deposition rates seem to be consistent
> with what we know about the river. Do you agree? Do you think that the
> predicted sediment deposition are within the error margin of the
> modeling output and thus are highly uncertain?

>

> One final thing, please copy me on any future questions sent to LWG
> representatives.

>

> Thanks, Eric

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> Hi Jessica - sorry for the delay in getting back to you. The sole
> purpose of Slide 32 in the presentation was a setup for the diagnostic
> charts. It shows the location of the cells selected for diagnostics,
> and whether or not a particular cell is located in a net deposition or
> net erosion area. The sedimentation rates shown on this figure are
> those predicted by the sediment transport model, which is why you see
> such a high level of precision in the values. Also, as you noted, we
> have called out many more cells on this figure than the six diagnostic
> cells we focused on during the presentation. The reason we did that was
> because we had diagnostic plots ready for all of these (beyond the six
> we actually showed during the meeting) in case Earl wanted to see them,
> which he said he didn't.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> Michael J. Werth

> ANCHOR QEA, LLC

> mwerth@anchorqea.com

> This electronic message transmission contains information that may be
> confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of
> litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual

> or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be
> aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents
> of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic
> transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jessica Winter [mailto:Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov]
> Sent: Monday, August 09, 2010 5:34 PM
> To: Jennifer Woronets; Michael Werth
> Subject: Re: FW: July 19th Chemical Fate Modeling Presentation Posted
>
> Hi Mike
> Just following up-- if you already responded, I may have lost your email
>
> since I have been swamped recently (I got detailed to the Kalamazoo
> River oil spill). If that's the case, could you please resend? Thanks
>
> Jessica Winter
> NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
> 7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
> Seattle, WA 98115
> Phone (206) 526-4540
> Fax (206) 526-6865
> jessica.winter@noaa.gov
>
>
>
> Jennifer Woronets wrote:
>
>> Mike,
>>
>> Please see below question from Jessica.
>>
>> Thank you,
>> Jen Woronets @
>> Anchor QEA, LLC
>> jworonets@anchorage.com
>> 1010 NW Flanders, Suite 204
>> Portland, OR 97209
>> 503-688-5057 Ext 14
>>
>> Please note new address and phone number
>>
>> Please consider the environment before printing this email.
>>
>> The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or
>>
> entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be
> aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents
> of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic
> transmission in error, please notify us by electronic mail at
> jworonets@anchorage.com
>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Jessica Winter [mailto:Jessica.Winter@noaa.gov]
>> Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2010 3:51 PM
>> To: Jennifer Woronets
>> Subject: Re: July 19th Chemical Fate Modeling Presentation Posted
>>
>> Thanks Jennifer. I have a question on slide 32 of the main set of
>> slides. It shows a map of the river color-coded to indicate annual net
>>
>>
>> sedimentation rates. Do you know what this map is based on? (the
>> sediment transport model or the bathymetry measurements or what?) It's
>>
>>
>> somewhat surprising to me to see such high resolution indicated down
>>
>> to
>>
>> a millimeter per year (0.0-0.1 cm/yr vs. 0.1-0.5 cm/yr vs. 0.5-1.0
>> cm/yr) when the bathymetry gave data that was only accurate to within
>> about 7.5 cm and the model predictions were generally higher. I'm also
>>
>>
>> not clear what the outlined grid cells in this map represent-- six of
>> them are the cells plotted in the diagnostic charts and what are the
>>
>> others?
>>
>> Thank you!
>>
>> Jessica Winter
>> NOAA Office of Response and Restoration
>> 7600 Sand Point Way, Bldg 4, Room 2117A
>> Seattle, WA 98115
>> Phone (206) 526-4540
>> Fax (206) 526-6865
>> jessica.winter@noaa.gov
>>
>>
>>
>> Jennifer Woronets wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Portland Harbor Managers -

>>>
>>> EPA requested a copy of the slides that were used to support
>>> discussions in the Portland Harbor site July 19th chemical fate
>>> modeling meeting. The slides have been posted at:
>>>
>>> PHCP Files | Documents Under Review | 2010-07-19_LWR Fate and
>>> Transport Modeling Study Presentation
>>>
>>> Please note that the file "LWR_Fate_Model_20100719-1_EPA.pdf" is the
>>> main set of slides, and the other two files contain information for
>>> the "Calibration Graphics" and "Diagnostic Charts" sections of the
>>> discussion.
>>>
>>> Please let us know if you have any questions.
>>>
>>> Thank you,
>>>
>>> Jen Woronets J
>>>
>>> Anchor QEA, LLC
>>>
>>> jworonets@anchorage.com
>>>
>>> 1010 NW Flanders, Suite 204
>>>
>>> Portland, OR 97209
>>>
>>> 503-688-5057 Ext 14
>>>
>>> ü Please consider the environment before printing this email.
>>>
>>> The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or
>>> entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be
>>> aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the
>>> contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this
>>>
>
>>> electronic transmission in error, please notify us by electronic mail
>>>
>
>
>>> at jworonets@anchorage.com <mailto:jworonets@anchorenv.com>
>>>
>>>
>>>